REMARKS

Claims 1-33 are pending.

Claims 1-33 have been rejected.

Claims 1, 9, and 29 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Support for these amendments can be found, at least, within paragraphs [0037] and [0048] of the specification.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1, 9, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as purportedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicants have amended claims 1, 9, and 29 to address the Examiner's concerns. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection is overcome hereby.

Further, while Applicants disagree with the Office Action's interpretation of "coupled", Applicants have amended claims 1, 9, and 29 in accord with the Examiner's suggestions, in order to advance prosecution. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection is overcome hereby.

Double Patenting

Claims 1-7, 29-33, and 9-15 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as purportedly being unpatentable over claims 1-7 and 9-24 of U.S. Patent Application No. 10/696,156.

Given this provisional rejection, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be held in abeyance until allowable subject matter is indicated in this or the copending application.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as purportedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0051047 A1 ("Horel") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,708,828 ("Coleman") and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0088442 A1 ("Michael"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants respectfully submit that neither Horel nor Coleman, alone or in any combination, teach or suggest, at the very least: (1) generating a target inventory transaction in a target computer system, where the target inventory transaction is part of a synchronizing process performed in response to a source computer system inventory transaction, and (2) committing the inventory transaction information in the target format to target inventory transaction information of the target computer system by performing the generated target inventory transaction. Independent claims 9 and 29 recite comparable limitations. Applicants note that Michael is not cited against any of the limitations of independent claims 1, 9, and 29, and so is taken to be irrelevant to these claims.

Horel is cited as purportedly teaching the previously and currently claimed limitations covering "synchronizing", "extracting", and "converting." *See* Office Action, pp. 5 and 6. Notwithstanding other deficiencies of the Office Action's position, Applicants respectfully submit that Horel fails to teach or in any way suggest features comparable to the newly recited limitations, as well as the existing limitations. This lack of teaching in Horel is due to Horel's complete silence on any type of transaction being performed in a source computer system that ultimately results in a transaction being performed in a target computer system. Horel further fails to show, teach, or suggest anything mildly suggestive of the chain of events between the claimed transactions. Given this complete lack of teaching in Horel, it necessarily follows that Horel also fails to teach any specific method by which a process such as the claimed synchronization might be accomplished using source and target computer system inventory transactions.

Applicants further submit that Horel fails to teach the new "generating" and "committing" limitations, at least because Horel is directed at a much simpler problem: translating data. Plain data is not comparable to any type of transaction, and thus the fact that Horel simply manipulates data provides no basis for characterizing Horel as somehow teaching the claimed synchronization, nor the claimed generating a target inventory transaction and committing inventory transaction information in a target format to target inventory transaction information of the target computer system.

Coleman is cited solely for the purported disclosing of an integration server. *See* Office Action, p. 6. However, among a raft of other failings, Coleman is equally silent as to the claimed concepts of "generating" and "committing." Thus, Coleman also fails to teach or in any way suggest the newly added limitations.

The Office Action concedes that neither Horel nor Coleman disclose the claimed "inventory transaction information." *See* Office Action, p. 4. However, Applicants disagree with the Office Action's position that it would be obvious to use Horel and Coleman with inventory transaction information. As discussed above, both Horel and Coleman are simply concerned with manipulating pieces of data. Plain data is simply representative of a quantitative value, which is clearly distinguishable from a transaction. To wit: plain data is not <u>performed</u>. By contrast, the claimed method of synchronization is performed in response to performing a source inventory transaction, and the inventory transaction information in the target format is committed by performing a generated target inventory transaction. Thus, the fact that neither Horel nor Coleman, alone or in combination, contemplate anything like the claimed inventory transactions completely prevents either reference from teaching or even suggesting the claimed limitations that are directed to inventory transactions.

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that neither Horel nor Coleman, alone or in combination, provide disclosure of all the limitations of independent claims 1, 9, and 29, and all claims depending therefrom, and that these claims are in condition for allowance. Applicants therefore respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections to these claims.

Application No.: 10/696,371

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the application and the claims therein are believed to be in condition for allowance without any further examination. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned.

If any extensions of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) are required in order for this submission to be considered timely, Applicants hereby petition for such extensions. Applicants also hereby authorize that any fees due for such extensions or any other fee associated with this submission, as specified in 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17, be charged to Deposit Account 502306.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Samuel G. Campbell III /

Samuel G. Campbell III
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 42,381
Telephone: (512) 439-5084
Facsimile: (512) 439-5099